

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the official action dated December 2, 2005. Claims 1-34 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1-34 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 14, 21, 22 and 32 have been amended. Claims 1-34 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 14, 21, 22 and 32 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1, 14, 21, 22 and 32 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 1, 14, 21, 22 and 32 render claims 1, 14, 21, 22 and 32 compliant with all formality requirements, and therefore request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

§101 Rejections

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to a disclosed invention that is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

More specifically, the Examiner asserted that the language "presenting a first electronic document including a plurality of data entry devices" in claims 1, 14 and 21 is inoperative because "data entry devices" are hardware and can not be included in an electronic document.

Applicants have deleted the language "data entry devices" from claims 1, 14 and 21 and submit that the amendments to claims 1, 14 and 21 render claims 1-21 compliant with §101. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejections under §101 be withdrawn.

§112 Rejections

Claims 1, 14, 17 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, applicants note that the language "data entry devices" has been deleted from the claims, and that the language "automatically providing information indicative of another portion of received data to each responding one of service providers" is supported in the specification at, for example, column 7, lines 39-67.

Regarding claim 17, applicants note that the language "after a given time period, said application selectively automatically makes at least a portion of said stored information available to each of said service providers based upon said stored information" is supported in the specification at, for example, column 7, lines 1-19.

Regarding claim 21, applicants note that the claim has been amended to read, in pertinent part: "said application periodically generates and transmits via said computer network an electronic mail message to said identified one or more service providers, said electronic mail message including information indicative of a portion of said received data." The language of the amended claim is supported in the specification at, for example, column 3, line 59 - column 4, line 21.

§102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1-11, 13-18, 20-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Walker et al. (US Patent 5,862,223).

Claims 12, 19 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Sutcliffe et al. (US Patent 6,052,122).

Applicants submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 14, 21 and 22 are patentable over Walker and Sutcliffe.

Applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 22 is directed toward a method and system for matching potential clients with professional services providers. Each of the claims recites receiving data concerning potential clients and automatically comparing the received data to stored data for the purpose of identifying one or more suitable professional service providers (see, e.g., col. 5, line 33 - col. 6, line 20). The claims further recite notifying the potential clients of the suitable service providers, receiving an indication of one or more selected service providers chosen from among the suitable service providers, and automatically generating and transmitting an electronic mail message to the selected service providers (see, e.g., col. 6, line 5 - col. 7, line 38).

Neither Walker nor Sutcliffe discloses notifying potential clients of suitable service providers, receiving an indication of one or more selected service providers chosen from among the suitable service providers, and automatically generating and transmitting an electronic mail message to the selected service providers. Accordingly, applicants submit that claims 1, 14 and 22 are patentable over Walker and Sutcliffe - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 21 is directed toward a system for matching potential clients with professional services providers. Each of the

claims recites receiving data concerning potential clients, periodically comparing the received data to stored data for the purpose of identifying one or more suitable professional service providers, and periodically generating and transmitting an electronic mail message to the identified services providers (see, e.g., col. 3, line 1 - col. 4, line 21).

Neither Walker nor Sutcliffe discloses receiving data concerning potential clients, periodically comparing the received data to stored data for the purpose of identifying one or more suitable professional services providers, and periodically generating and transmitting an electronic mail message to the identified services providers. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable over Walker and Sutcliffe - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, applicants believes that dependent claims 2-13, 15-20 and 23-34 are patentable over Walker and Sutcliffe for at least the same reasons discussed in connection with claims 1, 14, 21 and 22.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

Reissue
Application No. 10/645,450

DRIZZO 3.0-001 RE

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: January 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Bruno Polito
Registration No.: 38,580
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUML HOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicants

623849_1.DOC